



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/072,622	02/07/2002	Lieping Chen	07039-331001	3225
26191	7590	08/06/2004	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C. 3300 DAIN RAUSCHER PLAZA 60 SOUTH SIXTH STREET MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402			OUSPENSKI, ILIA I	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1644	

DATE MAILED: 08/06/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/072,622	CHEN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	ILIA OUSPENSKI	1644

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 March 2003.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) 1-23 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's Preliminary Amendment, filed 03/18/2003 is acknowledged.

Claims 1 - 23 are pending.

2. The instant application appears to be in sequence compliance for patent applications containing nucleotide sequence and/or amino acid sequence disclosures.

Restriction Requirement

3. The following is noted:

Claim 15 includes a recitation a method for inhibiting T cell activation in a subject, whereas dependent claims 18 and 22 recite subjects that have either an autoimmune disease or a transplant rejection. These methods are distinct because they are directed at different patient populations and pathological conditions which differ in etiologies and therapeutic endpoints. Therefore, restriction of these methods is set forth as separate groups irrespective of the format of the claims.

4. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. § 121:

I. Claims 1 – 7, drawn to a purified mutant ICOS polypeptide, classified in Class 530, subclass 350.

II. Claims 8 – 11 and 23, drawn to isolated nucleic acid encoding mutant ICOS, vector comprising the nucleic acid, host cell comprising the vector, and

method of making the polypeptide by using the host cell, classified in Class 536, subclass 23.5; Class 435, subclasses 69.1, 455, 252.3, and 320.1.

III. Claims 12 – 21, drawn to a method for inhibiting T cell activation by using ICOS polypeptide, wherein the subject has an autoimmune disease, classified in Class 514, subclass 21.

IV. Claims 12 – 17 and 22, drawn to a method for inhibiting T cell activation by using ICOS polypeptide, wherein the subject is a transplant recipient, classified in Class 514, subclass 21.

5. Groups I and II are different products. Nucleic acids and polypeptides differ with respect to their structures and physicochemical properties and require non-coextensive searches, therefore each product is patentably distinct.

Groups III and IV are different methods. Methods directed to treating subjects with different pathological conditions are distinct because they involve different subject populations and different therapeutic endpoints; therefore, they are patentably distinct.

Group I and Groups III – IV are related as product and process of using. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the polypeptide of Group I be used for making antibodies, in addition to the methods of treating recited.

6. These inventions are distinct for the reasons given above. In addition, they have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by different classification and/or recognized divergent subject matter. Further, even though in some cases the classification is shared, a different field of search would be

required based upon the structurally distinct products recited and the various methods of use comprising distinct method steps. Moreover, a prior art search also requires a literature search. It is an undue burden for the examiner to search more than one invention. Therefore restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Species Election

7. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed Inventions I, III, and IV: wherein the amino acid substitution is:

- (A) Ser76Glu, or
- (B) Lys52Ser.

These species are distinct because their structures are different. Furthermore, the examination of species would require different searches in the scientific literature.

Applicant is required under 35 USC 121 to elect a single disclosed species to which the claims would be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claim 1, for example, is generic.

8. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed Invention III: wherein the autoimmune disease is:

- (A) rheumatoid arthritis,
- (B) systemic lupus erythematosus, or
- (C) diabetes mellitus.

These species are distinct because the pathological conditions differ in etiologies and therapeutic endpoints; thus each condition represents patentably distinct subject matter.

Applicant is required under 35 USC 121 to elect a single disclosed species to which the claims would be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claim 15 is generic.

9. Applicant is advised that a response to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 C.F.R. § 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. M.P.E.P. § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 of the other invention.

10. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. *Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product* will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See “Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai*, *In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b),” 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. *Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.*

Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

11. Applicant is advised that the response to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed.

12. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a diligently-filed petition under 37 C.F.R. § 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(h).

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ILIA OUSPENSKI whose telephone number is 571-272-2920. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9 - 5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christina Chan can be reached on 571-272-0841. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ILIA OUSPENSKI

Patent Examiner

Art Unit 1644

July 26, 2004

Phillip G
PHILLIP GAMBEL, PH.D
PRIMARY EXAMINER
TECH CENTER 1600
8/4/04